DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 463 CS 204 462

AUTHOR Thorn, William J.
TITLE Frederic Hudson's Nineteenth Century Critics and the Research Agenda for Press Historians of the 1980's.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (61st, Seattle, Washington, August 13-16, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Book Reviews; *Historiography; *Journalism; Literary Criticism; Negative Attitudes; *Newspapers; News Reporting; Press Opinion; Reference Books; Research Needs; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Hudson (Frederic); *Journalism History

ABSTRACT

Although Frederic Hudson's "Journalism History in the United States from 1690 to 1872," the first major survey of American journalism, has been a major reference since its publication in 1873, an examination of book reviews that appeared in the New York press following the book's publication reveals surprisingly sharp criticisms of the book that raise questions about Hudson's accuracy. The reviewers found that Hudson had been inaccurate in omitting a number of significant journalists, in overemphasizing the New York "Herald" (for which he was managing editor) as the exemplar of contemporary journalism, and in repeating gossip. They further found that Hudson had a misconception of the press of his time, overemphasizing the newsgathering role and underemphasizing the analytical editorial role, criticisms that raise questions about the conventional conception of the post-Civil War press. The reviewers' fundamental criticism of the book was that it lacked any historical or philosophical conception of the press around which it might have been organized. Finally, the critics found Hudson's writing style slovenly and reflective of "Herald" newspaper copy. The critics' views suggest that despite its commercial success the "Herald" was not considered a positive model but a negative one by a number of other newspapers, suggesting new lines of research for journalism historians. (GW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED163463

Prederic Hudson's Nineteenth Century Critics and The Research Agenda For Press Historians of the 1980's

By

William J. Thorn
Asst. Professor

College of Journalism
Marquette University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William J. Thorn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS204462

Presented to the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Seattle, Wash., August 1978

In part because Journalism History in the United States from 1690 to 1872 was the first major survey of American journalism, and in part because Frederic Hudson played a significant role in some of the history which he recounted, the book has been a major reference in the field since it first appeared in 1873. Indeed, George Henry Payne, Alfred M. Lee, S. N. D. North, William G. Bleyer, and Edwin Emery have all relied on Hudson, particularly for the period between the rise of the penny press and the Gilded Age, the period during which Hudson was first a reporter, then the managing editor of the New York Herald.[1] However, James M. Lee and Frank Luther Mott have both challenged the credibility of Hudson's work.[2] Examination of seven book reviews which appeared in the New York press following publication of Hudson's history reveals surprisingly sharp criticism of the book which likewise raise questions about Hudson's accuracy and suggest a research agenda for press historians of the 1980's.

Publication of Hudson's history was acknowledged in at least seven New York periodicals: the Evening Post, the Sun, the Times, the Tribune, and the World among newspapers; Harper's Monthly and The Nation among magazines.[3] In addition, two obituaries following Hudson's death in a train accident in 1875 also commented critically on his history of journalism.[4] Of the seven book reviews, only two did not find weaknesses in the book, and those two, from the Sun and Harper's Monthly, were the shortest reviews which did little more than note the author's high reputation as a journalist and the book's place as the first of its kind. All of the reviewers complimented Hudson for attempting a work which

needed completion, for his research on the press in pre-Revolutionary America, and for his compilation of valuable data on the press. The five critical reviews and the two posthumous accounts challenged Hudson on four related points: inaccuracy, misperception of the nature of the press of his time, lack of historical or philosophical perspective which might have given shape and organization to the work, and slovenly writing. In analyzing the book, these critics raised issues about the nature of the press which could help shape the research of contemporary historians of the press, for in addition to questioning Hudson's accuracy as Lee and Mott did, they pointed to omission of a number of figures and newspapers considered important, and they chided Hudson for ignoring the intellectual influences on the press.

The reviews were of varying length, but in general they were hardly minor reviews. The World gave a full page to the book review, the Times 7/8 of a page, the Evening Post a full column, the Tribune half a column,[5] and the Sun a quarter column. Among the magazines, The Nation gave it a quarter page, and Harper's review ran slightly shorter than The Nation's. To put the reviews in perspective, it should be noted that the World used most of its page to trace its own history of the development of a free press in England and America after dismissing Hudson's, while the Times used most of its space to summarize the book. That material aside, the World and Times reviews would have run about the length of the Tribune review.

To be sure, book reviews are not per se the most reliable evaluations of the merit of any particular work, let alone an historian's, as the recent discussion in Journalism History made

historian's, as the recent discussion in Journalism History made clear.[6] Yet, these seem to be legitimate and powerful reviews for an historian's purposes because they have been written by those most competent to detect inaccuracy and flaw in the work. Then, too, given the general atmosphere of mutual examination and criticism typical of the New York press in this era, the reviews might be seen as a form of dialogue about the press, an extension of the daily process of mutual correction. It is, in effect, a family history being discussed by the nearest relatives, with all the problems attendant to interfamilial analysis. For example, it is quite possible that one or another of the reviewers was biased by Hudson's account of that reviewer's newspaper. And, given the criticism that Hudson misperceived the nature of the press of his day, that point bears continued study. Personal animus toward Frederic Hudson seems less likely a problem in these reviews inasmuch as all agree on Hudson's stature as a journalist, and most reviewer's expressed disappointment was that he did less than they had expected of him. It was frequently observed that Hudson was far better as a journalist than an historian. Surely the reviews must be appraised not only with the originating publication in mind, but also in full recognition of the bias each critic might bring to a conception of journalism history. Nonethe less, on the four points cited here, the concensus among the reviewer's about Hudson's shortcomings take on enhanced significance because they are the product of those most intimate with Hudson's topic. Thus, the reviews can no more be dismissed as the fruit of competitive journalism any more than they of themselves prove Hudson wrong.

Briefly, the posture of the reviewers can be summarized in the following way based on the content of the reviews. Unfortunately not even signatory initials were used to identify the authors. The Times review was scrupulously nonabrasive, though it did not ignore the major flaws. The reviewer's approach was to allow that some might find a particular element a failure, but also to allow that Hudson deemed it better to handle it as he did. Despite its length, it was a less than fully analytical criticism of the book. The World review was more satisfactory in its development of the criticism of inaccuracy, though the World obituary article of 1875 was more direct. The Evening Post review most thoroughly examined the perceived shortcomings of the book of all the critical articles. The Nation and the Tribune reviews were no less critical than the others, simply briefer in pointing out the flaws because they stated them with but moderate explanation. On the two central criticism raised here, Hudson's perception of the press of his time and his lack of historical conception, all the reviewers agreed. There wer other differences among the seven articles which will be dealt with as the points arise later.

By 1873 it was clear to the reviewers that the history of American journalism had been too long neglected by historians. The Times reviewer observed that in contrast to the wealth of such histories in Britain, France, and Germany, America had only two books on the New England press and biographies of three New York publishers: James G. Bennett, Horace Greeley, and Henry J. Raymond.[7] Both the World and Times critics cited the

literature of press history in Europe at the outset of their articles, and the World began with a series of quotations on the significance of the press including those of Napolean, Carlyle, and Burke among others to emphasize the importance of the topic. The other reviewers, all of them, agreed that Hudson was addressing a clear need. For all but two, however, he failed to do more than amass considerable information about the topic. The Sun critic wrote about the book:

> Its ample pages -- and there are nearly eight hundred of them -- are filled with recollections, philosophy, anecdotes, facts and documents, many of them hitherto little known or difficult of access, all of them exceedingly important to the subject. 8

The critics of Hudson's work did not disagree that Hudson had produced such a work, but they argued that it was little more than a collection, and a collection full of inaccuracy and not a little chaos. The Evening Post critic noted that Hudson had pulled together much "curious and out-of-the-way material" from "rare files in the libraries of historical societies," making his history of ante-Revolutionary press valuable.[9] Good as that work had been, however, the Evening Post reviewer agreed with the assessment made by The Nation:

> The subject of this book is so important that the book itself deserves attention, but we cannot say that Mr. Hudson has succeeded in accomplishing the task set before him. 10

The harshest criticism came in the posthumous article in the World where the writer dismissed the book as "a rag bag of shreds and patches."[11] The problem with the book, the writer continued, was that Hudson lacked judgement.

The critics raised three issues central to historical analysis as well as the peripheral historical matter of slovenly style. Those issues were accuracy, conception of the press and historical or philosophical analysis of the role of the press. These issues are closely related, for the inaccuracy related in part to Hudson's omission of a number of significant journalists, to his overemphasis on the Herald as the exemplar of contemporary journalism, as well as to repitition of mere gossip. At the same time, Hudson's conception of the press was perceived as too Herald-oriented, too ignorant of the intellectual influences on the press and the strength of news analysis among the newspapers. Both of these issues, it was argued, seemed to flow our of Hudson's inability to put the press in an historical context which might develop the role of the press in a democratic state. Each of these issues has other implications, of course, but at the core they can be seen as closely woven arguments critical of Hudson as an historian of the press.

The inaccuracy cited by the critics, other than the Times critic who found the work an impartial account of the rise of the contemporary press, was of two forms. At its simplest, it was the use of material without verification of its accuracy. As the World critic observed, "As an editor it became him to verify where he has been sometimes content to merely repeat."[12] This inaccuracy appeared, the reviewers argued, in both his historical review and his use of contemporary materials. The World critic faulted Hudson's complete reliance on sources for his statements about the first newspaper, the authenticity of a German newspaper's claim to have been the first to print an account of Pizzaro's discovery of Peru, and, given his concern

for firsts, for his lack of material on the press of China.[13] Such material, the writer said, was readily available in several places.[14] A related inexactness was charged by the critic for The Nation, among others: "inflated gossip of the 'repertorial' sort is his vein."[15] There is, in this, a slap at the Herald, to be sure, for underlying much of the criticism is the view that Hudson had remained too loyal to his former employer in writing his history. The Tribune critic was a bit more specific about the problem:

> The details of the work in regard to The New York Herald are more copious and apparently more accurate than the general body of its contents, and the information is pro-- bably to be relied on in the main. [16]

On the same point, the World writer of 1875 said the problem was largely one of judgement carried over from his reporting days:

> He lacked a sense of proportion -- a measure of values, and gathered news a fishermen cast their nets, sweeping up everything within bounds, and, unlike them, counting a bull-pout the equivalent of a pompano, and a sheepshead as no better than a half-devoured limb from the Morgue. [17]

The Evening Post critic agreed that the Herald had been overestimated and that inexactness was a problem . Yet, apart from the specific source problems cited by the World reviewer, there is about the criticisms of gossip something of the insider's perception which does not admit of ready historical evaluation beyond caution about reliance on Hudson. It may be that the reviewers found Hudson had slighted their own papers, but the related issues suggest that this is less the case than factual

accuracy. The Evening Post critic noted that "oftentimes men of comparatively little force are made to take a controlling part in newspaper affairs, while others of great mark and weight are not mentioned at all."[18] And, the World reviewer observed that the book included both gossip and misinformation along with the valuable information.

Closely related to the factual inexactness in sources and references, was the accusation of misconception of the press of the time owing to a preoccupation with the Herald and the business enterprise of the press. This criticism is surely better supported and more significant for subsequent historians than inaccuracy. Each of the four critical newspaper reviewers and the authors of posthumous articles in the Evening Post and World claimed that Hudson simply did not fully understand the press of his own day, because he gave too much emphasis to the newsgathering role and not enough to the analytical editorial role. As the Evening Post reviewer summarized the argument:

> That it is the great object of a news journal to print the news we may all admit. But Mr. Hudson recognizes nothing beyond. A great corps of reporters and interviewers, a vast circulation, a fleet of news yachts, a large office crowded with advertisers, a sheet bristling every day with startling headlines, these are the constituents that go to make up his ideal daily paper.[19]

The World reviewer claimed Hudson's model was wrong, for the news gathering role and the rush to print had become the inferior half of a newspaper's role with interpretation and the formation of public opinion as the superior half, particularly in a democracy where the press affects the power to rule. The Times critic regretted that Hudson's admiration of news enterprise had

blinded him to the other two equally important roles of contemporary journalism: educating the public and forming public opinion.

The surprising placement of news enterprise in these analysis is perhaps best explained by the Evening Post's 1875 article on Hudson:

> In our day newspapers are pretty nearly upon an equal footing in the matter of getting news, and it would not be easy for one far to excel its fellows in that respect, however diligently its manager might work or lavishly spend....diligence, shrewdness, lavish expenditure in gathering information count for greatly less than they once did. They still have their part to play in journalism, but it is now a subordinate part. 20

Analysis and editorial evaluation had surpassed news, in the view of these critics because the press had grown beyond the rush to print news to providing its readers with "the best thought of the time on every subject and from every source."[21] The newspaper, in their eyes, had become an engine of democracy, an exemplar of good taste, an educator of the public, and a purveyor of news.

It wasn't that these reviewers rejected news gathering or reporting; in fact the Times included a description of the lengths to which that paper went each day to obtain the news. It was a clear and direct repudiation of the Herald definition of a newspaper which these writers believed was the only one Hudson knew. The Evening Post reviewer complained that Hudson underestimated the power and responsibility of the press so that it seemed "the evident purpose of the book is to magnify the New York Herald," at least as an institution.[22]

The papers competed, then, on the strength of the richness

of their coverage of emerging ideas and the validity of their commentary. During this period, for example, the World regularly convered speeches of various intellectuals and gave verbatim reports of John Fiske's lectures at Harvard University on Darwinism.[23] It also devoted a weekly column to new ideas in social science and gave considerable space to reviews of art, literature, theater and architecture.[24] The Times had already developed its reviewing staff, and other newspapers reviewed the arts and literature. Aside from these cultural articles, there were the editorials and essays that served democracy through the formation of public opinion.

Related to this defect was the problem of omission of people and newspapers the critics judged significant to the history of the press, particularly to the Tribune and Evening Post critics. The Tribune charged that Hudson had been too concerned with the roots of material success in the press and too little with the intellectual roots, and he provided a list of 27 names.[25] The Evening Post critic added the names of five newspapers which he deemed historically significant, including Willis' Corsair, the Hartford Mirror, the Baltimore American, the Augusta, Georgia Constitutionalist, the Richmond Examiner of 1848-1865 and its editor, John Moncure Daniels.[26]

Taken in the aggregate, these criticisms raise new problems for the press historian, for their analysis of the role of news flies in the face of conventional analysis of that period in which Mott found the news principle "to triumph over editorial comment as the leading function of the American newspaper."[27] Emery, too, conluded that the primacy of the news function emer-

ged in the wake of the Civil War.[28] Surely the criticisms about overemphasis of the Herald definition of a newspaper merit further examination. And the view that Hudson ignored the intellectual roots of the press coincides with a presently emerging concern in historical research on the press, a concern which can only be underscored and augmented by the critics' addenda to Hudson's cast of significant figures and newspapers.

Finally, the critics' perception of the press of their own time suggests a model of historical development in which the press can be seen to have two divergent and contrasting thrusts, the gathering and transmission of news information on the one hand and the analysis of events coupled with the teaching role on the other. These roles, the informer and the teacher, seem to pull against each other both within individual newspapers and among newspapers within a particular community in such a way that there is generally an equilibrium at some point along the line between them, but never a static balance point. The introduction of new technology upsets the equilibrium by giving greater impetus to the informer role, largely by making it possible to gather more information from a broader territory and disseminate it to a broader audience. The very act of making it possible triggers an alteration in the balance when for competitive reasons the technology is employed. The resulting advantage to the first user of new technology sets off a chain of competitive reactions which further alter the balance. Only when all the competitors have the same technological capability would the balance shift back toward the teacher role, eventually reaching a new equilibrium, perhaps some distance from the earlier point. The

profit motive might have the same effect on the equilibrium as new technology inasmuch as profit relates to both advertising and circulation. In any event, these reviewers have raised issues which bear more extensive examination, if only to discover the extent of their fallibility.

The fundamental criticism of Hudson's history was the lack of any conception of the press around which the book might have been organized and material trimmed or expanded. The critics sought, and failed to find, a thematic approach to the abundance of information which Hudson gathered, a shortcoming which caused them to variously label the book "an encyclopedia,"[29] a "chronicle,"[30] a "collection,"[31] and "sketches, scraps, gossip, information, misinformation, narrative, facts, figures, and history."[32] The Times critic had hoped to find a view "of the mission of a free and enlightened Press among a free and enlightened people."[33] The Nation's critic caustically remarked that Hudson had put together every imaginable kind of gossip, anecdote, and newspaper history in such a way as to leave the history of journalism in the United States unwritten. As the World writer brutally said in 1875:

> The history of journalism in this or any great country is a noble, far-reaching theme, but Mr. Hudson rises to it as he rose to condign admiration of the journal which he served, and its feats of enterprise when celebrated in its own columns. It it had any dignity in his eyes, the reader is not compelled to perceive it; if if consequence, he was not equipped with the philosophic ken to see and mark it. [34]

The Tribune critic granted that it contained much of value, abounding in dates, reports of profit and loss and other facts, but complained that "it forms a valuable book of reference for

the mousing Dryasdusts with whom a date is of more importance than a doctrine or a description."[35] Like the other critics, the Evening Post writer wanted more than a catalog of material about the press. The better goal of a press history, he said, was,

> to show how the newspaper has supplanted the popular orator, has driven eloquence from the bar, the hustings and the legislative hall, and in a measure superseded even the pulpit; to note the disappearance of the pamphleteer.... and to set forth the duties and responsibilities of journalists under the new political and social conditions of the country; this were a task of the most worthy and philosophic mind. [36]

Both the World and Evening Post critics perceived the press as a contemporary extension of the long tradition of oratory which went back to the ancient Greek democracy. The World critic, after surveying the rise of the press as a democratic instrument in the British and American forms with an analysis studded by quotations and citations from the defenders of free press,[37] compared oratory and the press by placing the press in the context of ancient Greece. The conclusion: Alexander the Great would never have conquered the world if there had been a newspaper in Greece.[38] The Evening Post critic's view of the press in his day as the educator, debator and engine of democracy draws, though though not so directly from the concept of Greek democracy.

Just as the lack of theme created difficulties with the omission of many significant names for the critics, it also led to a division of the history of the press which made less than complete sense. The Times critic allowed that they were inaccurate but convenient divisions, but the World critic characterized

them as compartments into which Hudson cast his collection. For The Nation's critic they were purely arbitrary divisions unrelated to schools of journalism or a philosophic view. The Evening Post critic found in them a more offensive logic as divisions "preliminary to the farthest development of journalism in the Herald....blocks composing the monument on which sits in enduring brass the image of its founder."[39] For most of the critics, Hudson was inaccurate in his divisions because he did not understand how the press had developed, but for the Evening Post critic Hudson's failing was perceiving all American press history as a prelude to the rise of the Herald.

Hudson's writing style was no less criticized than his divisions of the press into grand epochs. A common complaint was that it emulated the writing in the Herald. After citing some examples of butchered verse, The Nation's critic sniffed, "It is needless to say that Mr. Hudson's style was formed in the office of the Herald."[40] Others called it slipshod and slovenly, but the Times critic allowed that it was simple a brisk and lively style that made no attempt at fine writing. As the later World writer noted,

> His style also has the kind of badness for which we look in the reporters' English of some of our newspapers today, though there is no newspaper in New York which has not improved in this respect since Mr. Hudson's time. 41

The writing, though not perceived as a major flaw, gave rise to the view that Hudson had too closely observed the Herald and too little observed the other newspapers, yet additional proof that he was too Herald-oriented.

In conjunction with the problems of organization and lack of theme, perhaps the writing set up an internal conflict in

the book with which the critics did not fully grapple. At the level of style and accuracy of some of the material, Hudson seemed to be interested in a popularized account of the press, but at the same time it was full of material of interest only to the serious historian and so lacking in overall theme that it failed as popular history. Likewise, its inaccuracies and writing level made it unacceptable as serious history, as did its other failings cited earlier. Surely the problems reflect Hudson's difficulty in trying to write an 800 page book after 30 years of turning out bright copy for the Herald. That, after all, may be the basic difficulty with the book as history for the critics. Not only did they perceive a number of instances of misjudgement and inaccuracy, but as the World writer of 1875 implies, they held him to the standards of an editor:

> With abundant leisure at his disposal...he took no pains to verify its statements where verification was easy and a duty, but gathered whatever had been committed to print upon the subjects of his research as if whatever had been printed was true, forgetting that a correction the next day which might salve the consciences of too little scrupulous journalists was out of his power as a book-maker to circulate as widely. 42

Even as they held him to an editor's standards, they believed Hudson's sympathies had never left the Herald and had simply been translated into his history. J. M. Bloch, who wrote a history of the rise of the New York World in the 1860's, observed that the writings of journalists were often less than useful and reliable as source material, for too many journalists recounted unrelated news events and anecdotes with little validation and few footnotes.[43]

An interesting but unrelated criticism made by the Evening Post reviewer addresses a topic of no small concern in journalism education, the need for college training and liberal education. Hudson, in the view of this critic, seems an early journalistic primitve as Dennis defined them.[44] Specifically, the critic took strong exception to Hudson's claim that the newsroom was the best college for a reporter, particularly right after Hudson had claimed that all professional men, journalists included, ought to be cultured. The critic agreed that newsroom experience could teach tact, quickness of thought and action, cool judgement and ready use of resources, but it could not provide either broad education or culture. The habit of study and a foundation of knowledge, he argued, must be present before the student journalist enters the newsroom, for they rarely come afterward. And, these were seen as essential to good reporting:

> It is a grave mistake...to suppose that at present day nothing more than a habit of rapid composition derived from practice, and a thorough familiarity with the machinery of the newspaper that can only come from years of service in the establishment of a great journal are demanded of the editor. 45

College education, it was argued, was essential to the journalist.

The critics of Hudson's history who evaluated the book in Hudson's time have raised significant issues, though without further study of their case, at the present they do little more than suggest new lines of research while raising additional questions about the conventional conception of the press in the period after the Civil War. Certainly they seem to suggest that

a Whig view of press history in which the Herald model of journalism and great commercial success have been perceived as the signs of progress, even to the exclusion of the intellectual trends in press history. In short, while recognizing factual inaccuracy in Hudson's account, subsequent historians may well have continued to accept his perception of the nature of the press of his day.

Opposition to the Herald and its approach to journalism may surely have caused Hudson's contemporaries to more severely criticize his work, but even if it did, the strength of that opposition suggests that a new conception of the press at that time is due. The fact that the Herald was so strongly resented, or at least that Hudson's Herald-centered view was resented, indicates that despite its commercial success the Herald was not considered a positive model but a negative one by a number of other newspapers. Specifically, they argued that the press had grown up, had taken a larger and more responsible role in democracy. In the aggregate, the critics are accusing the Herald of Hudson's time as being anti-intellectual and therefore an unworthy model of journalism. Progress, by their definition was not in the direction of more news but toward more work in the realm of ideas as the teacher of the public and the engine of democratic government through debate and discussion of ideas. The dichotomy between the teacher and informer roles of the press, then, may well serve as a better model for new study of the press of this period.

FOOTNOTES

[1] George H. Payne cited Hudson for material on the colonial press (p. 46), on Major Benjamin Russell who was seen as the forerunner of James G. Bennett (pp. 143-144), and on Amos Kendall's relation to the Globe (p. 235). Alfred M. Lee cited Hudson's history second in his bibliography without comment and used it as the reference for over 20 points in his text. S. N. D. North used no bibliography but cited Hudson as the reference 7 times. Willard G. Bleyer called Hudson the author of the first comprehensive history of American journalism and cited him in the bibliographies of 9 of his first 12 chapters. Edwin Emery found Hudson valuable, particularly for his time.

[2] James M. Lee said, "This book is so full of errors, and is so biased in its point of view that it cannot be accepted as an authority even for the period with which Mr. Hudson was familiar," History of Journalism, Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1917 p. xii. Frank L. Mott wrote that Hudson was diffuse and unreliable but valuable for suggestions. American Journalism, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962, p. 66.

[3] "NEW BOOKS," The New York Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1, column 1. Untitled, New York Sun, Jan. 3, 1873, p. 4, column 4. "NEW PUBLICATIONS," New York Times, Jan. 4, 1873, p. 2. "NEW PUBLICATIONS," New York Tribune, Jan. 10, 1873, p. 6, column 1. "HUDSON'S JOURNALISM," New York World, Jan. 13, 1873, p. 2. "Editor's Literary Record," Harper's, v. XLVI (Feb. 1873), p. 457. Untitled, The Nation, no. 398 (Feb. 13, 1873), p. 120. The list is not exhaustive, but others have not yet been found.

[4] "Frederic Hudson and Journalism," New York Evening Post, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 2, column 2. Untitled, New York World, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 5, col. 1.

[5] The column was double width, however, so the size relative to the other newspapers must be doubled to about one full column.

[6] "Jefferson the Father of Slave Children? One View of the Book Reviewers," and "Professor Brodie Replies," Journalism History, v. 1, no. 3 (Summer 1976), pp. 56 - 60.

[7] Among English histories the author cited F. K. Hunt, The Fourth Estate; Alexander Andrews, The History of British Journalism; James Grant, The Newspaper Press: Its Origins, Progress, and Present Position (noted as deficient). For the French press he cited H. Hatin, Manual of the Liberty of the Press in France; Germain, Martyrologe de la Presse, 1818-1868, Fernand Giraddin, La Presse periodique de 1789 a 1867; and several brochures: Edouard Herve, La Presse et la Legislation de 1832; and Dupont White, La liberte de la Presse et la Suffrage universal. The

American texts were Isaiah Thomas, History of Printing; J. T. Buckingham, Reminiscences; Memoirs of James Gordon Bennett, the Life of Horace Greeley, and Henry J. Raymond and Thirty Years of the New York Press.

8 New York Sun, Jan. 3, 1873, p. 4.

9 New York Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.

10 The Nation, no. 398 (Feb. 13, 1873), p. 120.

11 New York World, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 5.

12 New York World, Jan. 13, 1873, p. 2.

13 Referring to Hudson's table of "The First Newspapers," the critic observed: "Mr Hudson has not verified the statement which he repeats from Galignani's Messenger that a paper called Gazette was printed in Nuremberg, Bavaria, as early as 1457....Less even do we credit the authenticity of the printed sheet in the 'Libri Collection,' called Neue Zeitung aus Hispanien und Italien bearing the date February, 1534." The latter purported to carry the account of Pizarro's discovery. The critic also questioned the inclusion of the Chronicle which Hudson said had been printed at Cologne in 1499. Even if it had, the critic said, why not look to the Chinese who had invented moveable type long before the Europeans, assuming being first in time was significant. World, Jan. 13, 1873, p. 2.

14 He cited specifically the transactions of several "Oriental societies, especially the Journal of the Asiatic Society," and a book which Hudson had neglected, J. Vict. Le Clerc, Des Journaux Chez Les Romains.

15 The Nation, p. 120.

16 New York Tribune, Jan. 10, 1873, p. 6.

17 World, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 5.

18 New York Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.

19 Ibid.

20 New York Evening Post, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 2.

21 Ibid.

22 Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.

[23] Darwinism was only one of the philosophical topics dealt with in the World's pages at this time, for it was a matter of regular coverage of significant speakers in New York that produced articles on Swedenborgianism, Positivism, and other ideas moving through philosophy, theology, medicine, the arts, and science.

[24] David G. Croly was largely responsible for instituting the regular social science column, and it normally ran two columns wide for a full page or more.

[25] Theophilus Parsons, Benjamin F. Hallett, Elizur Wright, Joshua Leavitt, Parke Godwin, Evert A. Duycinck, Cornelius Mathews, Richard Hildreth, C. F. Briggs, R. Shelton Mackenzie, David L. Child, O. A. Brownson, S. Irenaeus Prime, Margaret Fuller, E.P. Whipple, William C. Prime, S. S. Conant, Charles Nordhoff, E. L. Godkin, Richard Grant White, Charles G. Leland, J. M. Bundy, I. Chamerlain, Charles D. Warner, Prof. W. Swinton, R. H. Stoddard, and F. B. Sanborn.

[26] The Corsair because Thackeray first appeared there as a London correspondent; the Mirror because the poet Brainard wrote regularly for it; the American because of Cruse and the circle of accomplished wits of the "Red Book"; the Constitutionalist because its support of Lincoln in 1860 caused the Douglas defections in Charleston and Baltimore; and the Examiner of 1848-1865 because it was "one of the ablest and most brilliant papers ever published in the country, and this opinion was shared by those who held its doctrines in the liveliest abhorrence." The family which owned the Examiner included the minister of the United States to Turin and a justice of the U. S. Supreme Court.

[27] Mott, p. 384.

[28] Edwin Emery, The Press and America, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: 1972, p. 261.

[29] The Times, Jan. 4, 1873, p. 2.

[30] Tribune, Jan. 10, 1873, p. 6.

[31] The Nation, Feb. 13, 1873, p. 120.

[32] World, Jan. 13, 1873, p. 2.

[33] Times, Jan. 4, 1873, p. 2.

[34] World, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 5.

35 Tribune, Jan. 10, 1873, p. 6.

36 Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.

37 Included in the citations were Milton, Burke, Sheridan, De Tocqueville, Hume, Erskine, Junius, Johnson, Goldsmith, Lord Brougham, Hallam, Sir Francis Burdell, Canning, Bulwer, Mansfield and Benjamin Franklin.

38 Alexander would have been defeated in Greece because all of the Peninsula would have risen up in arms as Athens did and "the young man of Macedon would have been stopped at the threshold of his career." The assumption was that just as Demosthenes' speech had aroused the Athenians, it would have aroused all Greece had there been a newspaper to carry it.

39 Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.

40 The Nation, p. 120.

41 World, Oct. 22, 1875, p. 5.

42 Ibid.

43 J. M. Bloch, "Rise of the World in the Civil War Decade," unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Harvard University, 1948, introduction to the bibliography.

44 Everette E. Dennis, "Journalistic Primitivism and the New Journalism," New Journalism, ed. Marshall Fishwick, Bowling Green, KY: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1975, pp. 122/24 - 134/36.

45 Evening Post, Feb. 6, 1873, p. 1.